



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/487,405	01/18/2000	Suman Preet Singh Khanuja	U-012567-2	3123

140 7590 05/20/2002

LADAS & PARRY
26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10023

EXAMINER

CHAKRABARTI, ARUN K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1634

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2002

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.
09/487,405

Applicant(s)
Khanuja

Examiner
Arun Chakrabarti

Art Unit
1634



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED May 2, 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on May 2, 2002. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See attached sheet

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 6-13

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____


The request for reconsideration has been considered but does not place the application in condition for allowance because:

1. The applicant argues that none of the references relate to an in vitro screening method for identifying insect tolerant genotypes or clones at the somaclonal variant stage. This argument is not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

As made clear in the office action, Sondahl reference (U.S. Patent 5,436,395) teaches in vitro screening method for identifying insect tolerant genotypes or clones and also teaches exposing somaclones to different conditions (Abstract, Column 5, lines 39-52, and Column 11, lines 36-38, Column 7, lines 23-47, and Column 14, lines 40-41).

2. Moreover, applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine the references. This argument is not persuasive, especially in the presence of strong motivations provided by Gilbert since Gilbert states, "There are many techniques available for the analysis, comparison and characterization of plant genotype and these include isozyme electrophoresis, restriction fragment length polymorphism and randomly amplified polymorphic DNAs (RAPDs) (Column 5, lines 45-52)". Moreover, Sonadahl et al state, "In particular, this invention relates to the unique application of tissue culture methodology as new methods for variety development, breeding and then the scale-up of the selected superior genotype (Abstract, last sentence)".


W. Gary Jones
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1800